

Section III:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the
DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

Section IV:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121
REMARKS

Objection to the IDS List

In the Office Action, it was stated that the US patent documents listed in the Information Disclosure Statement were not considered by the Examiner, as this portion of the IDS list contains inaccurate information. Applicant is supplying herewith a substitute IDS list in which the US patent document information has been corrected.

Copies of two of the appropriate US patent documents, as correctly identified by the US patent number but which were incorrectly identified by applicant name and issue date, were originally included with applicant's IDS. The third US reference was incorrectly identified by US patent number (one digit typographical error), as well as applicant name and issue date. For these reasons, a copy of the third IDS item, US Patent 5,936,220 to Hoshino is enclosed herewith.

Applicant requests consideration of these three US patent documents, as applicant originally made a *bona fide* attempt to correctly submit these items with the originally filed IDS (MPEP 609, 37 CFR §1.97(f)).

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the examiner has objected to several typographical errors appearing in the specification, and has suggested corrections. This amendment corrects these errors without adding new matter.

Please note that applicant has corrected errors as noted in the Office Action, but that the notations in the Office Action where such errors are found of page number and paragraph number appear to be referring to the paragraph numbers and page numbers as they appear in the published patent application, US 2003/0159071 A1. These paragraphs have been incorrectly renumbered during publication, for example, by adding paragraph numbers to section and subsection titles. Title 37 CFR 1.52(b)(6) states in part:

...Paragraph or section headers (titles), whether abutting the left margin or centered on the page, are not considered paragraphs and should not be numbered.

In compliance with Title 37 CFR §1.121(b)(1), the amendment made herein is made relative to the paragraph numbers as originally filed in applicant's disclosure.

With respect to objection and requirement of correction of lists of items separated by commas, wherein the applicant omitted a comma between the last and second-to-last items, it is acceptable according to standard usage of British and American English to optionally include or omit such final comma. For example, <http://www.Bartleby.com> provides the following usage instruction:

CONTENTS - BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

Kenneth G. Wilson (1923–). The Columbia Guide to Standard American English. 1993.

SERIES CONSTRUCTIONS list three or more words, phrases, or clauses of roughly equal weight in syntax. In speech, intonation, and in writing, punctuation (usually a comma) links the several items in the series: They issued us our eating utensils: a tin cup, a mess kit, a spoon, a knife, a fork, and a canteen. Conventionally, the last two items in the series are linked with a coordinating conjunction, usually (but not always) preceded by a comma in written American English. Some American and most British stylebooks permit omission of this comma when the conjunction is there, but it is easier to include both every time.

With respect to the requirement to “unbold” the letter “a” in the sentence “Turning to Figure 1, a generalized architecture is presented ...”, which appears in paragraph [0024], this is an error produced by the USPTO in the published patent application. The bolded “a” does not appear in applicant's originally filed text, as evidenced by the appropriate scanned page in IFW. Applicant is not allowed to amend the published patent application.

With respect to the requirement to correct the spelling of “finctionality” in paragraph [0037], this spelling error only appears in the published patent application, and does not appear in the applicant's originally filed disclosure, as evidenced by the appropriate scanned page in IFW. Applicant is not allowed to amend the published patent application.

Entry of the amendment, and withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Objections to the Claims

In the Office Action, objections to claims 1, 7, and 13 were made for apparently missing an “if” in the phrase “determining if said master key value...”. The amendment corrects this typographical error without adding new matter.

Entry of the amendment, and withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action, the examiner has rejected claims 1 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for lack of novelty as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,182,229 to Nielsen (hereinafter “Nielsen”).

Nielsen’s disclosure is silent as to:

- (a) indexing password and usernames in a the master password file or vault for any other uses other than logging into “remote servers” (col. 6, line 44 - 46), and is especially silent as to providing an open application interface such that both web browsers and non-browser applications alike can access the same password wallet;
- (b) overlaying the master password entry dialog box directly placed over the original password entry box so as to block view or direct entry of information into the original password entry box;
- (c) providing a pop-up which lists a set of user-selectable user-names when more than one user-name and password pair is found for the application program which is requesting access to the master password wallet; and
- (d) performing a local verification of a directly-entered application-specific password to find a match in the locally stored master password, and preventing submission of passwords for which no local match is found, thereby preventing submission of invalid passwords to the requesting application program or web site, and preventing potential subsequent lock out of the application and/or divulgence of the user’s alternate favorite passwords to the application program or web site.

We have amended our claims to specify these elements, steps, or limitations. MPEP

2131 states:

TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF
THE CLAIM (*capitalization emphasis found in original text*)

For these reasons, entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejections, and
allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Frantz

Agent for Applicant(s)

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

Tel: (405) 812-5613